

Edited by John Harney and John Rimmer

Summer 1971

Alan Sharp takes a critical look at 'Operation Trojan Horse'.

**KEEL
UNDER FIRE**



E D I T O R I A L

Flap

Once again a flap is in progress and following the usual pattern. Most of the reports are of vague "lights in the sky", easily explained by the popular science pundits.

Any really interesting reports will inevitably be lost in the welter of mistaken observations and uninformed comment. Apart from the publicised reports there seem to be the usual rumours of more spectacular sightings circulating, which will not be reported to the news media for fear of ridicule.

When it is all over a few good reports will be sifted out for the ufologists to argue about until the next flap.

L E T T E R T O T H E E D I T O R

From Miss JANET GREGORY

I read with great interest Peter Rogerson's article 'The Sun Maiden' in issue 4:2 of the Bulletin; but it is not about the theme of that article that I am now writing. Mr Rogerson quotes a statement I once made about the validity of skywatches ("I favour the idea that the watchers have to be... somehow in tune with whatever controls UFOs before they will appear... preferably a small, harmonious group should sit quietly and think about UFOs") and, at the time, that is what I believed. I am now even less in favour of ordinary skywatches than I was then, and I will try and explain why.

The basic reason for holding a skywatch is to see a UFO; a slightly more sophisticated skywatch wants to photograph a UFO; an even more sophisticated one wants to get instrumented proof on dials and charts that a UFO has passed over. Just supposing that all these were achieved - where does that get us? Even such ostensibly foolproof evidence will not convince those who do not wish to be convinced, and we are left with another bunch of frustrated and embittered ufologists. The experience of the last 20-odd years, since ufology came into being, has surely shown that nothing is gained by concentrating on spotting and documenting lights in the sky; nothing, that is, beyond proving over and over again that UFOs exist. Ufologists (I use this term widely, to include all who are genuinely interested in the phenomenon) do not need this continual proof, and those who are not yet ufologists will become such when the time is right for them. That is, you can lead a horse to water (show a man proof of the existence of UFOs) but he will not drink until he is thirsty (will not believe until his development has reached the appropriate stage). As well as the ordinary layman, this applies to scientists and everyone else upon whom the "scientific" ufologists are trying to force a belief in UFOs.

So all the evidence points to the fact that we should concentrate on the 'Why?' rather than the 'How?'. A conventional skywatch concentrates on the 'How?' (if it concentrates at all), and my earlier statement, quoted above, indicates concentration on the 'Why?'. It is obvious that UFOs are here on Earth for a reason, and the evidence seems to suggest that this reason is concerned with we humans, our past, present and future. The evidence also suggests that we are ignorant and have much to learn, that we could learn if we would only open ourselves to the teaching, but that for various reasons this teaching cannot be given by a ufonaut from a soapbox in Hyde Park or in any other direct way. I will not go into details here; those who have got on to the 'Why?' will know what I mean, and those who have not will understand when they are thirsty enough.

Those who are skywatching in the way I suggested, trying to tune in with the ufonauts, might hope that they will attract a UFO and cause it to land, thus perhaps getting the answer to 'Why?'. I now think that this is unlikely, too, for the conditions would very rarely be favourable for such an event. The UFOs do not often do as we ask them, probably for our own good. But the basic idea is right, solitude, peace and harmony both externally and internally. Contactees are usually alone and mentally quiet when the UFO lands and the ufonaut steps out to deliver his message; and recent research shows that

frequently the contactee is psychic too. Somehow, albeit unconsciously, the contactee has tuned in to the correct wavelength, and everything is right for the contact. The individual has been chosen because he is right for the ufonaut's present purposes.

And so, although skywatches might be jolly good fun, and help to boost our egos that we are actively doing something to help solve the great UFO mystery, a little honest thinking will soon tell us that we are not, and that whatever other values skywatching might have (astronomy, appreciation of nature, etc.), as regards UFO research it is a complete waste of time.

Janet Gregory, 34a Barnsdale Road, LONDON, W9 3LL

DO YOU KEN JOHN KEEL?

by Alan W. Sharp

A few issues of the Bulletin ago (November 1970) I wrote a short article in which I referred rather disparagingly to John Keel as the "King of the UFO Crackpots". Although I feel that in many respects my assessment, in UFO parlance, was not very far off the mark I should like to apologise to Mr Keel for such an ungentlemanly expression of opinion.

The choice of phrase was, however, of interest for it turns out that, quite unknown to me, a henchman of Dr Allen Hynek had previously coined exactly the same expression to describe Mr Keel and this, to use the sort of reasoning which Mr Keel frequently seems to use himself, can hardly be without significance. For myself, I do not subscribe to such reasoning and prefer to regard the identity as purely coincidental and arising solely from a similar assessment of John Keel's contribution to ufological research.

One result of the correspondence which my remarks--described vaguely by Mr Gary Lesley as "silly" (Letters, MUFOB 4:2)--called forth has been a determined attempt by me to see whether my judgement was at fault and a drastic reassessment needed in the light of a more concentrated study of Mr Keel's published work. I know that I tend to have formed, from experience, a not very flattering opinion of journalists for the simple reason that their reports of items upon which I have been well informed have usually proved factually incorrect and slanted to the point where they have seemed to bear very little resemblance to the circumstances as I knew them.

Lest any injustice has been done because of such bias on my part I have had another look at the book: "Operation Trojan Horse" with particular attention paid to those matters about which I can claim to possess a certain expertise. I must say at the outset, though, that my overall impression still persists, that the book is a typical example of journalistic ufology such as one has met so frequently before in the literature. Its accounts of events are frequently, even usually, sketchy and imprecise and the logic tenuous or non-existent. Hence the conclusions which its author draws, such as they are, tend to be erroneous. It is therefore scarcely surprising that John Rimmer (MUFOB 3:4) seems to have found the volume rather difficult to review.

To my way of thinking the book is not even good journalese, for the reason that the narrative is disjointed and confusing. A good deal of space is devoted to a more-or-less "normal" account of various UFO reports, after which Mr Keel abandons this approach and plunges his readers into the questionable world of fairies, demons and other similar figments of the imagination. Even from that viewpoint, however, the treatment is not a scholarly one which the reader might respect, but a story writer's presentation of the alleged manifestations of occult forces and the like, which is about as convincing to this reader as the fantasies of Denis Wheatley. To an extent this is perhaps inevitable in a popular work but it is certainly not to this writer's taste. He happens to have spent the

past year investigating certain properties of meteorites and moon rock and is well aware of the need for constant vigilance against the facile invocation of way-out hypotheses to explain unwelcome facts, whilst at the same time attempting to preserve an open mind receptive to the impact of ~~novel~~ novel ideas. It is the writer's opinion that John Keel is over eager to dump the "UFO phenomenon", as he calls it, into the realm of the supernatural and too ready to discount more mundane explanations of at least a goodly proportion of sightings; ignoring for the moment the possibility of extraterrestrial visitation, which the writer has never regarded as very likely. As an example of this uncritical and biased rejection I think it is instructive to consider the subject of meteors and meteorites upon which Mr Keel is obviously ill-informed.

There are, travelling around the Sun in orbits of various eccentricities, pieces of solid matter varying in size from particles of dust to objects having a mass of many tons. These are termed meteoroids and grade upwards into bodies which are large enough to be telescopically visible and are known as asteroids. Any such meteoroids which encounter the Earth, survive passage through its atmosphere and reach the ground in megascopic form are called meteorites.

A meteor is merely a streak of light produced by a small meteoroid in its passage through the atmosphere and is not a meteorite. It is thus incorrect to say, as Keel does (p 165): "Yet there are thousands of meteor falls annually." He also quotes (p 150) a Lt. Col. Rolph as saying: "A meteor can't be tracked by radar--but this thing was," and fails to question this incorrect statement. A vast amount of information about meteors has been obtained by just such means, due to the reflecting capacity of the ionised gases which emit the light constituting the optically visible meteor. By this reflection of radar waves meteors can be "seen" in daylight as well as by night.

The object under discussion in this instance was evidently a bolide and could have been associated with a meteoroid large enough for some portion of it to have survived and reached the ground intact. Unfortunately the information given by Keel is of the kind which causes the serious ufologists so much trouble. He says: "Shortly afterwards (referring to the reddish object which was seen moving in the sky on April 13th, 1962) an unidentified circular object landed near a power station outside of Eureka, Nevada, and the lights went out for thirty minutes." (Evidently a case of Post hoc ergo propter hoc.)

Was the connection established? Did someone see this thing land? Was it analysed? What did it look like, apart from being "circular", whatever that means? Where can one find the relevant details? Why was it "unidentified"?

This example is typical of so many descriptions in Keel's book and in the literature generally. The authors may (or may not) know the answers, but the reader justifiably feels that one case properly documented would be worth a dozen such nebulous reports.

Why Keel should doubt the validity of the bolide identification in this case and inveigh against the "scientific attitude", whatever he means by that, is a mystery to which only he can give the answer.

"What are these 'Things'", he asks, "and why don't we know more about them?" I suggest that he should replace the "we" by "I" and become a little more acquainted with the subject of meteoritics --and with astronomy generally at the same time, for that matter. He is very keen to make rude remarks about astronomers and other scientists, but is apparently very reluctant to become even reasonably conversant with the plentiful supply of relevant scientific

literature.

Meteorites can be broadly classified into irons, stones, and stony-irons; or siderites, aerolites and siderolites. A rather rare form of aerolite or stony meteorite is the type known as carbonaceous chondrite. Mr Keel describes the arrival of fragments of such a meteorite at a place called Pueblito de Allende at 1.09 a.m. on the morning of February 6, 1969. Scientists "scurried" there to collect the pieces and identified them as "Type 3 carbonaceous chondrite", translated by Keel to mean "metal fragments containing carbon, which is suggestive of organic (living) matter". According to Brian Mason, an authority on meteorites and curator of mineralogy at the American Museum of Natural History, New York, carbonaceous chondrites can "be readily distinguished from all other meteorites by their peculiar characteristics--dull black colour, friability, generally low density, LACK OR ALMOST TOTAL LACK OF FREE NICKEL-IRON (my capitals) (Meteorites, p96, Wiley, 1962).

Type 3 carbonaceous chondrites are largely composed of olivine with accessory pigeonite, not of metal. Olivine is a common rock-forming silicate mineral with the composition $(Mg, Fe)_2 Si_2 O_4$ with Mg in excess of Fe, and pigeonite is another silicate mineral having the composition $(Ca, Mg) (Mg, Fe) Si_2 O_6$ with even less iron. The iron is, of course, chemically combined. The carbon content of the famous Orgueil carbonaceous chondrite occurs in the 6.4% of black, insoluble carbonaceous residue which has the composition C 63%, H 6%, O 31% and is, according to Mason (ibid, p 99); presumably a complex polymer of high molecular weight".

It is, of course, "organic" in the sense that it is a carbohydrate, but this is a chemical description with absolutely no "living" connotation. In fact Mason goes on to say: "A solution of the organic material in benzene showed no optical rotation, an important observation indicating that the material was formed by non-biological processes".

There is no reason to suppose that the organic matter in the Pueblito de Allende carbonaceous chondrite was substantially different from this.

That Keel should choose to mislead his readers in so blatant a fashion whilst displaying his own ignorance of matters meteoritic is not only manifestly unfair to people who have purchased his book in good faith but also cannot fail to arouse grave doubts about the validity of his thesis generally, doubts which are demonstrably well-founded.

There is the matter, for instance, of the strips of aluminium foil which Keel mentions on page 175, remarking: "These strips are almost identical to the chaff dispensed by high-flying Air Force planes to jam radar, yet they do not seem to be related to AF operations at all". The first thing to note is that the material which Keel describes need not have been used for the particular purpose he mentions. Another application, for example, is for radar tracking in connection with meteorological work. The fact that some of the foil "is often found under trees and on porches" would only be remarkable if winds had mysteriously ceased to blow, which to the best of my knowledge they have not.

The Condon Report (Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects) deals with the subject of "space-grass" quite specifically on page 90, where a sample is mentioned as having been produced--on Earth--by the Foil Division of Revere Copper and Brass Inc., Brooklyn, New York. It would be difficult to be more specific than that. What Keel means to imply by use of the word "almost" is uncertain, but it does not strengthen his case, as one can see by reference to page 175 of his book.

He says: "Another exploding UFO, this one at Ubatuba, Brazil, in 1957, left behind particles which were nothing but pure magnesium". The word "almost" might well have been inserted in this statement as John Harney has demonstrated in his article; "The Ubatuba Magnesium" (MUFOB 4:2, p 19).

It seems that Mr Keel is not averse to deliberately attempting to mislead his readers when it suits his purpose to do so. There is much more that one could write along similar lines concerning Operation Trojan Horse, but this would savour of using a bulldozer to demolish a house of cards.

Whilst I have every admiration for people who write good books and bear John Keel no ill-will, I would like to suggest that he does something to remedy his lack of scientific knowledge before he commences his next literary work on the subject of unidentified flying objects. A thorough perusal of the Condon Report would be a good starting point and would help to eliminate some of the grosser errors in his text.

REPLIES TO NORMAN OLIVER AND OTHERS

by Peter Rogerson

Perhaps Mr Oliver confuses spiritualism and occultism with psychical research; his inclusion of a sub-committee on spiritualism and saucers (rather than psychical research and saucers) in COS-MOS suggests this is so.

If Mr Oliver would care to examine serious literature on psychical research he will see that the two are entirely disparate.

Psychical research (or parapsychology) is the impartial investigation of ostensibly supernormal phenomena.

Spiritualism is a religious faith based on the assumption that ostensible supernormal phenomena are evidence of the survival of discarnate spirits, further based on the assumption that seance room "messages" from ostensible spirits give an accurate description of the after life, and that moral or scientific discourses thus given are also accurate, this being a foundation of a religious creed.

Many psychical researchers have felt after years of study that a very tiny proportion of alleged paranormal phenomena are best explained by postulating some kind of post-mortem existence. Very many others have come to other conclusions. Very few (less than 5%) of psychical researchers have accepted the full creeds of the Spiritualist churches (This is what I call Spiritualism).

Most Spiritualists, to say nothing of psychical researchers, would object to being classed along with occultists. By occultism I mean firstly, the popular pseudo-sciences, such as astrology, palmistry, etc., secondly the numerous esoteric cults which seem to be flourishing with a renewed vigour in our troubled times.

In an article in the Journal of the Society for Psychical Research D.W.T.C. Versey of Queen Mary College, University of London, discusses occultism, differentiating between the power occultists (ritual magicians, cabalists, etc.): "motivated by a desire to gratify ambition and to fulfill secret yearnings and to dominate others; it may be defined as a belief that deficiencies of personality can be overcome by some esoteric formula, attainable through study and practice..." and wisdom occultists: "...the multifarious mystical and meditative brands of esoteric philosophy.. ..It rests on a tacit acceptance of unsatisfactory material or emotional conditions which, so it is believed, can be compensated for by spiritual progress."

This is just the beginning of Mr Versey's article, which cannot be quoted in full here. Further on is the crucial point that occultism completely saps the critical faculties of those involved. We must quote a few lines more, though:

"Psychical research, like hypnosis, has unquestionably suffered through the common delusion that it is in some way associated with the occult... The situation is further complicated by the fact that many occultists claim an interest in and knowledge of psychical research; a claim which, on analysis, usually proves to be unfounded. There is no common ground between the psychical researcher and the occultist, for the simple reason that the former is attempting to pursue an exact science, whereas the latter is neither exact nor scientific."

Even those who are reasonably sympathetic towards some aspects of occultism do not accept that occultism has anything to offer psychical research. In a critical reply to Mr Versey's article Richard K. Sheargold writes:

"I do not really believe that the claims of some of these groups (i.e. occultists) to knowledge of psychical research constitutes much of a menace to the S.P.R. One can hardly imagine that a person capable of being misled in this matter would be much of an asset to this Society."

Norman Oliver suggests that refusal to take some of the more colourful characters in ufology seriously is intolerance. This surely is a misuse of the word. My definition of intolerance would be to attempt to forcibly silence occultists, etc., on their own territory, as it were, the attempts by NICAP in America to shut down other people's conventions, for example..Mr Oliver does me a disservice if he thinks I would support action of that kind. I have the right, however, to think occultism is nonsense and to say so, just as Norman Oliver has the right to disagree. If some of the cultists had their way, though, neither of us would have any rights at all, for the cultists are among the most bigoted and intolerant people going. Once they take over a society or club, free speech or serious discussion in it is impossible, I know from experience. First hand knowledge of what the occultists and their ilk do if we allow them to get a foothold into ufology doesn't exactly enamour me to them.

I am surprised that Mr Oliver takes Bernard Byron, with his space voices from Kruger 60, etc., seriously. Even people like Arthur Shuttlewood and DAPRO have hinted that Mr Byron was not worthy of serious attention. Inviting people like this along, I would have thought, was rather a waste of time and money.

If Mr Oliver reads my contribution to MUFOB he will see that I am not especially concerned with "nuts and bolts" ufology. I will not however suspend my critical faculties by accepting the endless ramblings of pseudo-science, which seem popular in ufology today, even if they do come from retired air-marshals.

Our thanks to John Keel for bringing up the question of crypto-fascist takeovers in ufology. Modern occultism and fascism both originate in the same romantic reaction against rationalist liberal democracy in the late 19th century. One of the original occultists, Scott-Elliott, was a psychopath & anti-semite, and many occultist movements supported Hitler before the war. Today several cultist groups are conducting subtle anti-semitic and anti-negro propaganda under the guise of ufology. One well-known Australian magazine contains violently right-wing and anti-negro editorials in the guise of "Karmic law". This same magazine also carries violently anti-semitic articles and attacks on the "International Zionist Conspiracy", a stock phrase of fascism. Also there are violent attacks on fluoridation, which is regarded as a "Satanic

conspiracy to poison the Western world". This disgusting rubbish is served up with the usual admixture of Biblical quotations, which seem to be a hallmark of some of the more psychotic types which infest ufology.

An American based contactee organisation has also been active in spreading thinly-disguised anti-semitic propaganda, mainly assaults against the "International Bankers' Conspiracy". The director of this organisation also published a book in which he objected to the conventional picture of Christ as a Jew, rather than an "Aryan Superman".

A British magazine has also carried anti-semitic articles on the "World Zionist Conspiracy", and, in addition, anonymous and pseudonymous appeals for Nazi war regalia.

A virulent campaign of personal abuse has been directed at Dr Edward U. Condon. A chapter in Saunders' UFOs?: Yes!, applauding Condon's heroic stand against the House un-American Activities Committee in the 40's and 50's has been deliberately distorted to give the impression that Saunders was "exposing" Condon as a communist. The principal instigators of this verminous libel are a writer from Tennessee who accuses Condon of being a communist and a member of the Illuminati, along with a Californian (who, incidentally, sells documentary mathematical proof that America is God's own little acre, designed especially by the extraterrestrial builders of the Great Pyramid). This latter writer has also used the pages of a well-known UFO magazine to make despicable personal attacks on the late Martin Luther King and former Secretary of Defence, Macnamara. This writer and a colleague have also used the pages of this same magazine to tout two books, The Betrayers and None Dare Call It Treason, which are extreme right-wing hate tracts. Both contain lying, abusive libels against leading American citizens.

I feel that responsible groups and individuals can help to overcome this infiltration by (a) ceasing all communication and exchange with the offenders and (b) making sure that their own platforms and publications can not be used for the propagation of political, religious or racial propaganda.

LOCAL UFO REPORTS

Latest UFO Flap—Most Merseyside Reports Easily explained

Merseyside is having its fair share of UFO reports in the current flap. Most of these reports have so far been of the vague, "lights-in-the-sky" variety. Nevertheless they have generated considerable local interest. The reports have been given prominent coverage in the Liverpool Echo and the Liverpool Daily Post (from which most of the following reports have been taken). Your editor has twice been summoned to the studios of BBC Radio Merseyside to record interviews which were broadcast on the "Morning Merseyside" programme.

The flap appears to have broken out locally on the evening of July 11, when "reports flooded into the Daily Post." At 2040 BST two 13-year-old boys saw what was described as "a dome-shaped object, about 30 feet in diameter," from HUYTON.

At 2220, Mr Colin Godfrey and some friends saw "a white light" over WAVEERTREE Playground, Liverpool. He said: "It wasn't a helicopter or a plane. It hovered for a few minutes, and then moved very slowly, before suddenly disappearing. There was no sound from it, and there were no clouds in the sky."

At 2230 an ELLESMERE PORT resident said he saw "a white ball of fire" over the Shell refinery at STANLOW. "It was there for about two minutes and then vanished. There were no lights on it," he said.

Mr James Boner and seven friends were standing on Entwistle Heights, EVERTON, at about 2220 when they saw a "light hovering a bit, and then it disappeared. It couldn't have been a plane, because there were no lights. There was no sound."

A spokesman for the North West Air Traffic Control at Preston said

that they had received no reports.

At about 2200 that evening lights were seen over GARSTON. Mr Donald Pink, of Mossley Hill, said: "It was about 10... I saw one bright light, just like an electric light bulb in the sky."

Amateur astronomer Robert Halliday suggested that the cause of the sightings could be the Russian satellite, Salyut. Apparently it was visible on Merseyside at about the same time as the sightings. When discussing these sightings with us, Mr Halliday discounted the earlier report by the boys at Huyton. At 2240, when this sighting was alleged to have taken place, it was still full daylight, so it could not have been a satellite. Also it is difficult to see how the witnesses could have come to the conclusion that the object was "about 30 feet in diameter" when they had no way of telling how far away it was. We agree with him that this sighting must thus be regarded as doubtful.

The following evening, July 12, there was a report from HESWALL, Wirral, Cheshire. Mrs Alma Pardue, of Field Head, Marine Drive, Lower Heswall, said: "I was in my garden at 2145 when I saw two bright objects in the sky. The larger one was sickle shaped and the smaller like a saucer, and they both had a yellowish glow. They were quite plain to the naked eye but it was fantastic to watch them through binoculars. The big one had a terrifically bright light in front."

Mrs Pardue said that the objects were stationary at first. Then they made for North Wales, but suddenly turned and went off over the Irish Sea, leaving a trail-like vapour.

She said: "There was an aeroplane about at the time and I am sure that the pilot must have seen them. I have never seen anything like this before. My husband and a neighbour who also saw them were as astonished as I was."

On August 20, a UFO was seen over CROSBY, Lincs. A Crosby man said that at about 1845 he was watching a Viscount aeroplane flying overhead when a white object appeared, flying at the same height. He went inside his house for his binoculars and when he returned it had disappeared.

He said: "It suddenly reappeared in a different part of the sky and remained visible for about five minutes. It was a cylindrical shape, shining brightly, and appeared to have an object on top of it which looked like a conning tower."

This object was also seen by a neighbour and several nearby children.

The next rash of local sighting reports broke out on the evening of August 25. The Daily Post recorded reports from South Lancashire, Wirral and North Wales.

At PRESTATYN, three bright lights were seen turning to orange and blue, travelling in a roughly SE to NW direction at about 2100. Reports giving similar descriptions came from NESTON, WEST KIRBY and parts of LIVERPOOL. Later reports came from SOUTH LANCASHIRE and at FORMBY, "the flashing lights were accompanied by strong rumbling and dogs whining at local kennels."

It was reported that the lights "appeared to be stationary at times." A witness from PRESTATYN described the shape of the lights as being "...of a boomerang effect."

However, a few other reports for that evening were communicated to this Bulletin and these make the phenomena seem somewhat less mysterious. At 2234 a phenomenon was observed at CROSTON, Lincs, which appeared to be a satellite re-entry. The report tallied with descriptions of coloured lights and rumbling noises which appeared in the Daily Post. At about 2100 an aircraft was observed to fly low over BROMBOROUGH, from the direction of Liverpool Airport. This machine was displaying three groups of brilliant white lights—presumably landing lights. BROMBOROUGH residents are very familiar with low-flying aircraft, as Liverpool Airport is only about 4 miles away, but the appearance of this aircraft was so unusual that people stopped their cars and got out to watch it. When the aircraft passed over some of the other places from which UFO reports came that evening, it was probably at a much higher altitude, so that only the lights would have been visible.

On August 23, a UFO was reported from WALLASEY. Mr Ronald Wrightson and his wife, of Marshlands Road, saw a ball of light at 2230. While they watched, it moved in a straight line and hovered over Liverpool. "You had to turn your head quickly to follow it, because it was so fast," Mr Wrightson was quoted as saying. While it was still over Liverpool he looked at it through binoculars and it seemed "to be criss-crossed with lines."

On the evening of September 6, there was another flood of local reports. The first report received by the Daily Post was from a schoolboy, aged 14, of Litherland Road, BOOTLE, who saw the object at about 2110. He said: "It was

a brilliant light, heading over towards Liverpool. It was pretty high up when we saw it. It was not a plane, it was travelling far too fast." Scores of reports were also received by Liverpool Airport and Jodrell Bank. Mr Philip Leighton, secretary of Liverpool Astronomical Society, suggested sightings of Mars, or a satellite decay, as possible explanations. However, an observer at BROMBOROUGH, who had witnessed the spectacular aircraft of August 26, again spotted a plane carrying brilliant white lights. This one was much higher, but he could plainly hear its engines.

That evening there were reports from many parts of Britain of a glowing, cloud-like object. This was later stated by Glasgow Weather Centre to have been a fluorescent chemical cloud ejected by a meteorological research rocket launched from South Uist, in the Outer Hebrides.

Further local reports—if any—and comments about the flap will appear in our next issue.

BOOKS

reviewed by Peter Rogerson

APPARITIONS AND GHOSTS: A Modern Study, by Andrew MacKenzie, with a foreword by E.W.Lambert. London, Arthur Barker, 1971. 180pp, index. £1.75. ISBN 213 00291 4

This is the third of a series of works on modern spontaneous paranormal events, (the other works being The Unexplained and Frontiers of the Unknown) by Andrew Mackenzie, a member of the Society for Psychical Research. A wide variety of cases is discussed, ranging from alleged crisis apparitions to the Grey Man and other apparitions seen on the slopes of Ben Macdhui in the Cairngorms. Among the latter is a 'man in black' resembling the traditional figure of the devil. G.W.Lambert, in his introduction, remarks that the 'man in black' is a stock apparition that is possibly explainable in psycho-analytical terms.

The events described have been subjected to as close an investigation as possible, and are of a far higher evidential standard than the uninvestigated, often vague, newspaper reports which seem to be the stuff of ufology at the moment.

With the growing interest in possible parapsychological origins of UFO reports, I recommend this work as a serious and authoritative examination of the spontaneous parapsychological phenomena. A welcome relief from the mass of paperback trivia on the subject.

GHOSTS, by Eric Russell. London: Batsford, 1970. 3 plates, bibliography, index. £1.60. ISBN 7134 0322 5

This admirable work is a critical history of the ghost story, especially the Victorian variety. Eric Russell demonstrates the fallibility of eyewitness testimony, the eccentricities of the credulous, and the danger of accepting testimony uncritically from people because they sound 'respectable' or 'important'. In this context I heartily recommend it to ufologists in the hope (forlorn, I fear) of convincing them that a degree or a title is not a magic amulet guaranteeing infallibility of the senses, which no human being possesses.

UFOs are briefly discussed by comparing Sir Arthur Conan Doyle with George Adamski. Doyle is quoted as an example of the difficulties of investigating facts when apparently honest people describe totally impossible events.

MYSTERIOUS WORLDS; a personal investigation of the weird, the uncanny and the unexplained, by Dennis Bardens. London: W.H.Allen, 1970. 222pp, £1.80. ISBN 0 491 00264 5

An entertaining, but totally uncritical, examination of parapsychology, this book is noteworthy because of a routine chapter on flying saucers at the end. The author's apparent willingness to take Adamski et al seriously, tells against him somewhat.

There are two chapters on ghosts which are of some interest to the ufologist. The apparition allegedly seen by the author's son, and other members of a pop group in Cobham, Surrey, in November 1965, has often been quoted in the UFO literature.

GODS, DEMONS AND UFOS, by Eric Norman. New York: Lancet, 1970. 205pp, 95c (50p)

A way-out potpourri of fantastic events from 'Was God an Astronaut?' to Keeliana. Unfortunately all of this is totally undocumented, and poached from Von Daniken, Keel, etc., without any acknowledgement. Nevertheless, good bedtime reading.

OFFICIAL GUIDE TO UFOS, compiled by the editors of Science & Mechanics. New York: Ace, 1968. 139pp. 75c.

An interesting collection of articles by Lloyd Mallan, Gordon H. Evans and Frank B. Salisbury covering a variety of topics, including discussion of the Warminster flap and the Rita Malley case. A selection of cases from Bluebook is included also. One of the better paperbacks on the subject.

NOTES QUOTES & QUERIES

Kirkby Ghost

Residents of a block of flats in Kirkby, Lancashire, have been complaining that their homes are haunted and have been for the past two years. Families in the flats spoke of weird apparitions and wailing and moaning noises in the night.

Eventually a medium was called in and he said that the ghost was the earthbound spirit of a man who had been murdered on that site 100 years ago. Another medium who visited the flats prophesied a possible tragedy in the block in the near future, and the residents asked Liverpool Corporation housing department to rehouse them.

A journalist who spent a night in the allegedly most haunted room of the flats, equipped with note book and tape recorder, had nothing unusual to report.

Recently a resident claimed that the ghost had hurled him down a flight of stairs, and the latest news at the time of writing is that five families at the flats are refusing to pay their rents until the Corporation rehouses them.

Not the only one...

"Dan Fry's honorary degree (doctor of cosmology) was purchased from the St Andrew's Ecumenical University College of London, a degree mill, for sixty dollars." — QUEST-UFO REPORT, Vol. 2, No. 3. (439 Krug St., Kitchener, Ontario, Canada.)

EXCHANGE OF UFO SIGHTING REPORTS AND INFORMATION INVITED.

For details write to: Bernard Veal, 15 Vine Street, Widnes, Lancashire.

M e r s e y s i d e U F O B u l l e t i n

Volume 4 Number 3

Editor: John Harney, 53 Woodyear Road, Bromborough, WIRRAL, Cheshire, L62 6AY
Telephone: 051-327 2146

Associate Editor: John A. Rimmer, ALA, 6 Norgate Street, LIVERPOOL, L4 0RH

Science Editor: Alan W. Sharp, BSc, BEng, FRAS, FGS, Dip.Ed.

Opinions expressed by contributors are not necessarily shared by the Editors.

Printed and published by the Editors